

REMARKS

The office action dated September 24, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully noted. The examiner has required restriction to one of the following groups of claims:

- I. Claims 40-53, 64, 69-72 and 74-76 drawn to a device including a releasable connector, operating to disable the device upon the release of the connector, in a communication network;
- II. Claims 59-62, 66, 68 and 73 and 20 are drawn to a wearable device in operation with a further device in a communication system.


A provisional election to prosecute group I (including independent claims 40 and 48) is hereby made with traverse. However, the requirement is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn for the following cogent reasons.

The examiner alleges groups I and II are distinct from each other because they are unrelated. The examiner also indicates the inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that (1) they are not disclosed as capable of use together and (2) they have different designs and modes of operation and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification citing MPEP §808.02. The examiner alleges that, in the instant case, the different inventions: a device, e.g., a cellular mobile telephone which is attached to a connector, e.g., a strap and a wearable device, e.g., a wristwatch which is in operation with a further device, e.g., a mobile telephone. The separation of the further device from the wearable device causes a controller in the wearable device to detect a diminution of radio link and effects partial disablement of a further device that is the mobile telephone. In both cases, the mobile telephone is partially disabled. Accordingly, it is not seen that the groups set forth independent and distinct inventions so the restriction between groups I and II should be withdrawn.

The examiner alleges the inventions have acquired separate status in the art in view of their separate classification that is group I is classified in class 455; subclass 575.6 and group II is classified in class 340, subclass 573. The alleged species in the application are believed to be unpatentable over each other and are intimately interrelated. They should be examined together for reasons of efficiency and to avoid a later charge of double patenting. Furthermore, it is believed that examination of all the claims together would not place a serious burden on the examiner. MPEP §88.03. In the event the examiner continues the restriction requirement, applicant preserves its right to file a divisional application for the invention of group II, claims 59-62, 66, 68 and 73 and 20.

In view of the above, it is believed that all of the claims in the application are ready for examination and early action in that regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jack M. Pasquale
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,052

Date: October 17, 2007

JMP/kap
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234